

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant responds herein to the Final Office Action issued July 10, 2007.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the Application after the present Amendment. Claims 1-5 were rejected in the Office Action. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the Applicant's attorney during the telephone interview of April 23, 2008. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant amended Claims 1 and 4 and respectfully requests a reconsideration of the rejection.

#### ***Drawings***

The Examiner objected to the drawings of the present Application because, according to the Examiner, they do not include a reference character 21 (first section). Applicant respectfully submits that Fig. 4 includes the reference character 21 pointing to the first section. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections***

Claim 4 was rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant amended Claim 4 to more particularly recite that when the cage is rotated 180 degrees around the longitudinal axis of the handle, i.e., into a position shown in Fig. 2, where the roof is positioned downwardly (towards the ground) and shoulders 35 are positioned upwardly. This structure is described in paragraph [0019] of the specification. Accordingly, Claim 4 is now in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zimmers (U.S. Patent No. 2,738,214). Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jenkins (U.S. Patent No. 3,265,430).

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant amended Claim 1 to recite that the roof of the cage includes an opening dimensioned to allow the golf ball to protrude above the roof of the cage, as shown in Fig. 4. This limitation of the amended Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the

cited prior art. Claims 2-5 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-5 are allowable at least for the same reasons as Claim 1 and, further, on their own merits.

Favorable reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING FILED  
ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON May 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Anna Vishev  
Registration No. 45,018  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF/AV:db